

REMARKS

Before this amendment, claims 1-4 were pending in the application. The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,100,282, to Fletcher ("Fletcher"). For at least the reasons articulated in this paper, the Applicant disagrees, and submits that the Office Action fails to set forth *prima facie* rejections of the claims.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action asserts: "Fletcher teaches a converter in radio-frequency (RF) apparatus, the converter comprising a feedback circuitry (30, 16, 10, 15, see figures 1-2) having a shielded input 32 and shielded output 34, wherein the shielded input and the shielded output inherently tend to reduce interference in the converter." Office Action at 2. The Applicant disagrees.

At the outset, the Applicant notes that Fletcher's disclosure relates to a "shielding amplifier circuit" and "shielding circuits for use in a system handling low level D.C. signals and, in particular, to shield and shield connections for use in systems wherein the electrical signals being handled are floating with respect to ground." Fletcher at col. 1, lines 8-12. The Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Fletcher regarding the use of the disclosed circuit in a radio-frequency (RF) apparatus. Rather, Fletcher's teachings pertain to "a shielding circuit which will prevent deleterious effects due to occurrence of common mode voltages in a measuring system which includes a remote transducer and potentiometrically connected feedback amplifier." Fletcher at col. 2, lines 8-13

Furthermore, the Applicant disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action that "the shielded input and the shielded output [in Fletcher] inherently tend to reduce interference in the converter." As noted above, Fletcher's disclosure teaches the use of shields "which will prevent deleterious effects due to occurrence of common mode voltages in a measuring system which includes a remote transducer and potentiometrically connected feedback amplifier." Fletcher at col. 2, lines 8-13. To the Applicant's reading, Fletcher fails to teach a converter or interference in a signal converter or RF apparatus. If the Office wishes to rely on principles of inherency, the Applicant requests properly evidentiary support, such as an Examiner's declaration.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and therefore includes all of its limitations. For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to properly reject dependent claim 2.

With respect to claim 3, the Office Action states: “Fletcher teaches a method of reducing interference in a non-linear circuit in a radio-frequency (RF) apparatus, wherein the non-linear circuit 11, 12, 14 (fig. 2) has an input 32 and an output 34, the method comprising: shielding 32 an input of the non-linear circuit 11, 12, 14; and shielding 34 an output of the non-linear circuit 11, 12, 14 (fig. 2).” Office Action at 2-3. The Applicant disagrees.

First, claim 3 relates to a “method of reducing interference in a non-linear circuit in a radio-frequency (RF) apparatus.” As noted above, to the Applicant’s reading Fletcher fails to disclose either reducing interference or an RF apparatus.

Furthermore, without any citation to any of Fletcher’s teaching, the Office Action simply asserts that “Fletcher teaches a method of reducing interference in a non-linear circuit in a radio-frequency (RF) apparatus.” To the Applicant’s reading, nothing in Fletcher suggests a non-linear circuit in an RF apparatus. Rather, Fletcher discusses “measuring systems, [where] it is often necessary to connect one or more remotely located transducers or signal sources to an output device, with the transducers producing small magnitude D.C. voltages in response to changes in some physical phenomenon, such as temperature, pressure, rate of flow, and the like.” Fletcher at col. 1, lines 13-18. Thus, Fletcher’s teachings relate to D.C. voltages produced by transducers in response to physical phenomena. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to properly reject claim 3.

Claim 4 depends on claim 3 and therefore includes all of its limitations. For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to properly reject dependent claim 4.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a prompt Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to set forth *prima facie* rejections of the claims, and that the claims are in allowable condition. Consequently, favorable reconsideration and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that no fees in addition to the previously paid filing fees and the concurrently paid extension-of-time fees are due. If any fees other than the fee for the extension of time are due for any of the enclosed papers under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.21 for any of the enclosed materials, however, the Commissioner may deduct such fees from (or credit any overpayment to) deposit account number 50-3813/SILA-122.

The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON
Registration No. 46,469
Attorney for Applicant

LAW OFFICES OF MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON
P.O. Box 93005
Austin, Texas 78709-3005
Phone: 512-382-4404
Fax: 512-382-4405